

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPAREMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trudemark Office Address: COMMISSIONIER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 450 Alexandral Vicentia 22313-1450 wyw.usplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| 10/028,355 | 12/21/2001 | Daniel Evans | 14707HUUS01U (22171.305) | 3059 |
| 27683 | 7590 01/03/2007 | | EXAMINER | |
| HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP 901 MAIN STREET, SUITE 3100 DALLAS, TX 75202 | | | TECKLU, ISAAC TUKU | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| • | | | 2192 | |
| | | | | |
| | • | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 01/03/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|--------------------------|----------------------------------|------|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | 10/028,355 | EVANS, DANIEL | |
| Examiner-initiated interview Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Isaac T. Tecklu | 2192 | |
| All Participants: | Status of Applicatio | n: | |
| (1) <u>Isaac T. Tecklu</u> . | (3) | | |
| (2) Brandi W. Sarfatis, Registration No. 37, 713. | (4) | · | |
| Date of Interview: 12/2/1/2006 | Time: | | |
| Type of Interview: ☑ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic | ant's representative) | | |
| Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No If Yes, provide a brief description: | | | |
| Part I. | | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: | | • | |
| Claims discussed: 11, 20, 23 and 27 | | | ٠. |
| Prior art documents discussed: | | | |
| Part II. | | | |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet | RAL NATURE OF WHA | T WAS DISCUSSED: | |
| Part III. | | | |
| It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa | e examiner will provide | a written summary of the substa | ance |
| | | | |
| | · | | |
| | | • | |
| TUAN DAM | | | |
| SUPERVISION PATENT EXAMINATION | | | |
| (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applican | t/Applicant's Representa | tive Signature – if appropriate) | |

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner conducted a phone interview with Brandi W. Sarfatis to propose amendment to claims 11 and 20 to obviate 101 issues and indicate allowable subject matter. Applicant attorney agreed with examiner's proposal to amend the claims. In addition, Applicant attorney indicated, he would include additional claim limitation to claims 1 and 27 to expedite prosecution of the case. Applicant faxed draft copy of the proposed amendment on December 21, 2006, however since the case is a two month old and the official amendment was not received on time, examiner will conduct updated search once the official supplemental amendment is submitted to consider the new claim limitation added to claim 1 and 27.